



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: January 5, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2011-CAC-2843 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CROSS REFERENCE #: NA

TITLE: Submitting a Fraudulent Training Request (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, DC	

VIOLATION(S):

- 5 CFR § 410.3109(c) Failure to Fulfill Agreements
- Title 18 USC § 1001 False Statements
- Title 5 USC § 4108(2) Employee Agreements; Service Training

ALLEGATION(S): On or about August 16, 2011, complainant (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported an allegation of employee misconduct to the Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged Student Career Experience Program (SCEP) student (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) violated the rules and procedures of the Agency's SCEP, was double dipping and did not attend the college courses at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that the EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) program office paid for, and therefore caused (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) program office to lose money. At the time of the complaint, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was unable to clearly articulate exactly how much money (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) thought (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) program office lost. However during the course of the investigation it was determined that EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) paid approximately \$7004 for three (3) online courses to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on behalf of SCEP student (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

In regards to the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not attend the college courses at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that the EPA paid for, this investigation determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did start and complete three courses at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and earned grades for those courses. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) started and completed three online courses in fall 2010 and spring 2011, and received the following grades in those courses:

1. Fall 2010, MATH #221-Statistics for Decision Making; Grade "C"

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

Page 1

2. Spring 2011, BIS #155-Data Analysis with Spreadsheets with Lab; Grade "B"
3. Spring 2011, BUSN #115-Introduction; Grade "F"

In regards to the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was "double dipping", this investigation determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) refunded EPA at least \$2320. The remaining \$4684 was refunded to student (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as overpayment. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) officials they have a refund policy that stipulates that all refunds will go into the student's account on file. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admits that they did not follow their own policy and on at least two (2) occasions the EPA CC was refunded a total of \$2320 and then on at least two (2) occasions (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) student account was refunded for \$4684. However, as stated above (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did start and complete three courses. During (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) hiring process and acceptance into SCEP, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not disclose to the EPA Office of Human Resources or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) immediate supervisor (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was already receiving Pell Grant money, Federal Student Aid loan money, subsidized loans and an unsubsidized Stafford Loan to pay for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) courses at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). However, it is not a SCEP requirement for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to disclose such information. This investigation was unable to determine any criminal statute or administrative requirement that was violated when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was refunded the EPA funds for the courses that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had previously paid for through another means.

Lastly, in regards to the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had violated the rules and procedures of the Agency's SCEP, the Agency had already terminated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) prior to its contacting OI. The investigation determined that on approximately June 9, 2011, under the guidance and direction of the EPA, Labor and Employee Relations Office and the EPA, Office of General Counsel, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was terminated for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5). As a SCEP participant, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was supposed to attend and complete courses at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that the EPA paid for and then report (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) grades and progress to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) immediate supervisor. According to the EPA officials (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to complete the courses, did not report (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) progress and therefore (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was terminated. The EPA Officials contacted OIG, OI after they terminated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

DISPOSITION: Unfounded. Closed.

This investigation was unable to substantiate that any criminal violations took place as a result of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) receipt of EPA funds for the three college courses cited above. Additionally, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had been removed from the EPA prior to the involvement of the OIG. Since all appropriate actions have been taken, no further investigation is warranted. Therefore, this investigation is Closed in this office.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: JANUARY 26, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2013-ADM-0081

CROSS REFERENCE #: HOTLINE 2013-075

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION: Program integrity violation(s) – Impartiality in performing official duties

ALLEGATION: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as impartial in performing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) official duties allegedly due to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) romantic relationship with subordinate, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

FINDINGS:

- This investigation found (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in an inappropriate relationship with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) subordinate, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) but it did not prove (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) impartiality in performing official duties.
- On January 15, 2013 and February 21, 2013, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) received for action two anonymous complaints.
 - The first alleged (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who was married at the time, engaged in a romantic relationship with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who was also married at the time, and potentially promoted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) friends over those more qualified for multiple positions within (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).
 - The second also alleged (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in a romantic relationship with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and added (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attempted to “direct promote” (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to the position of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The second complaint also alleged (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) helped promote (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). Agent Note: Because the complaint was anonymous, we were unable to obtain clarification about what (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was an acronym for.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

- OPR conducted interviews, to include interviews of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as well as reviews of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) performance evaluations and both (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA email accounts.
- Both (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to their relationship and the inappropriateness of it. However, they both stated any promotion (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received was based on merit and not on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) involvement with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).
- Based on interviews and records reviews conducted during the course of the OPR investigation, though there were witness statements and emails supporting (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attempts to influence others to promote (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) efforts were unsuccessful and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) eventual promotion appeared untainted by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) influence.

Based upon the foregoing and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retirement from federal employment on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2014, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: JUNE 2, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AR-2014-ADM-0028

CROSS REFERENCE: HOTLINE COMP: 2014-17

TITLE: [REDACTED]; GS-15; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	WASHINGTON, DC	N/A

ALLEGATION: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] falsified an official government document (tolling agreement).

FINDINGS: No Report of Investigation was drafted due to the fact that on June 1, 2015, the EPA, based on the investigatory documents provided to them from an OPR investigation and their own investigation, issued a notice of proposed removal to [REDACTED] for three separate charges: Falsifying an official work document, Lack of candor, and Negligent performance of duties. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E)

DISPOSITION: On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015, the EPA issued a notice of proposed removal to [REDACTED] for three separate charges: Falsifying an official work document, Lack of candor, and Negligent performance of duties. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E)

[REDACTED] voluntary resignation, effective [REDACTED], 2015.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: JANUARY 14, 2015

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2014-ADM-0072

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-13, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	EPA REGION 3	

VIOLATION(S):

- Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1001 – False Statements.
- Title 18 U.S.C. Section 641 – Public money, Property or Records.
- Title 18 U.S.C. Section 666 – Theft or Bribery Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds.

ALLEGATIONS: On November 15, 2013, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received information from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) regarding a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA memorandum detailing information related to allegation(s) of falsifying time and attendance records by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA .

Specifically, the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) memorandum, dated November 5, 2013, indicated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) claimed 22 availability hours during training in May 2013 that should have been excluded from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) annual average for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and further, one of the five days (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) claimed was neither a training day nor an excluded day.

FINDINGS: On December 12, 2013, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by OIG Special Agents about (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) actions. On January 14, 2014, OPR presented the facts of this complaint to an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) at the U.S. Attorney's Office, Fraud and Public Corruption Section, Washington, District of Columbia. After reviewing the facts provided by OPR, the AUSA declined prosecutorial action relating to U.S.C §§ 1001, 641 and 666, which address

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

criminal offenses associated to falsifying records, theft of government property and embezzlement, respectively.

On April 29, 2014, OPR forwarded the foregoing information to [REDACTED] for their administrative review.

DISPOSITION:

On October 9, 2014, [REDACTED] EPA took administrative action against [REDACTED]. Specifically, [REDACTED] was notified that a decision was made to suspend [REDACTED] for fourteen (14) days for falsifying time and attendance records, failing to follow established leave procedures and failing to follow supervisory instructions.

This case is being closed with no further action.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: March 6, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

COMPLAINT #:

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); GS15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CLOSE COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

COMPLAINT:

On November 25, 2013, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), received an email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) former EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee who allegedly embezzled millions of dollars from the Shiloh of Alexandria Federal Credit Union. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was concerned about (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) potential involvement in the embezzlement.

SUMMARY:

During an accounting review at the end of the first or second quarter of the fiscal year (FY) 2013, the "call report" for the National Credit Union Association (NCUA) looked "funny" because a mistake was identified. The NCUA contacted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to discuss the discrepancy and the day before NCUA officials were to meet with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

When a credit union becomes insolvent, the NCUA takes over all the assets and pays out creditors. When the NCUA employs this practice, it is no longer engaging in a regulatory function.

The NCUA was able to retrieve financial account information on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The NCUA noticed large sums of money being transferred from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in the form of credit card payments. Subsequently, the NCUA sued (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) civilly, resulting in a \$200,000 judgement against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

On December 04, 2015 at approximately 1:23 PM (EST), OIG Special Agents conducted an interview with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, who is the custodian of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OGE 450 Forms. OIG Special Agents reviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OGE 450 Forms for the years 2010 – 2015 which revealed that none of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OGE 450 forms reflected any reportable outside employment, or any reportable gifts in the form of money.

On April 20, 2016, OIG Special Agents consulted with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA regarding money received by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA. The money given to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not reported on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OGE Form 450. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) advised (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that (b) (5) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) explained that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5)

RECOMMENDATION:

The OIG was not able to identify any violation, either criminal or administrative in nature. Based on foregoing investigative findings, this case is closed with no further action. However, if additional information is discovered or provided, OI will assess such information and take appropriate action.

ATTACHMENT(S):

None



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON BUILDING
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20460

DATE: JANUARY 12, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2014-ADM-0090

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2012-CFR-0180 AND OI-AR-2014-ADM-0037

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	William Jefferson Clinton West Building, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, DC 20004	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

VIOLATION: 5 U.S.C § 2302(b) (6) – Prohibited Personnel Practices

ALLEGATIONS: (2)

Approximately August 20, 2014, during the investigation of two other related cases: #OI-HQ-2012-CFR-0180 and OI-AR-2014-ADM-0037, Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (Case Agent) of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), 1200 Pennsylvania, Ave NW Washington, DC 20460, conducted an investigation related to the following; from 2006 through 2012, several EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees allegedly engaged in Prohibited Personnel Practices (PPP). The Case Agent reviewed email files which indicated potential new hires' resumes were intentionally altered, as well as position descriptions (PDs) intentionally altered to match the resumes of potential new hires.

The second allegation involved a separate investigation on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (case #OI-AR-2014-ADM-0037). The investigation concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) revealed that during the period from December 8, 2010 through December 18, 2010, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) incurred \$18,002.05, in Verizon International roaming charges on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA issued aircard while (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was on leave in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). Analysis of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA email box indicated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) utilized (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) aircard to send and receive personal and work emails while (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was on leave in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The EPA was charged for these excessive fees and through the working capital fund the EPA was paying for the monthly cost of the service plan. An EPA employee who requested confidentiality reported (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who was then serving as

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) The employee requesting confidentiality also reported that, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

FINDINGS:

Allegation 1: It was alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was involved in altering and / or had knowledge that PDs and resumes were being altered to assist new employees with obtaining employment with the EPA. These positions included paid intern positions, full time employment and promotions within the EPA.

Supported – During the August 7, 2014, interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in the presence of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) legal representative was advised of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Garrity Rights and Advisement Warnings. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) acknowledged (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) understanding of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) rights and then signed and dated the Garrity Acknowledgment of Rights form. During the interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was shown email files taken from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA email account which indicted in 2006, 2007 and 2010, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in email correspondence that showed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was involved in altering and / or had knowledge that position descriptions and resumes were being altered to assist new employees with obtaining employment with the EPA.

During the interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to violating prohibited personnel practices (PPP), and stated the following, *“This is the culture at the Agency and other offices are doing this as well. I will not name or identify the other program offices that are doing this as well”*. At the conclusion of the interview, and at the request of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attorney, the Case Agent prepared a sworn statement for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and submitted it to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attorney, but (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) refused to sign it.

The nature of the investigation fell directly under the purview of the Office of Special Counsel (OSC); therefore, a referral for action was made to their office in Washington, DC.

On August 13, 2015, Case Agent received a closure letter notification from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Attorney, OSC, Investigation and Prosecution Division, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). OSC concluded that violation 5 U.S.C. § 2308(b) (6)- Prohibited Personnel Practices did occurred and that the best corrective action was an OSC administered training session on prohibited personnel practices. The training occurred on July 29, 2015 (no further information) and subsequently OSC closed MA-15-1473 and took no further action.

Allegation 2: It was alleged that during a staff meeting, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was made aware of the incident involving (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) accruing charges of \$18,002.05 on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA-issued air card while on personal leave and while out of the country, but (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), either failed to take action and / or ordered the person in charge of reviewing ebusiness reports to stand down and then was taken off the duty of reviewing and reporting ebusiness reportable incidents.

Inconclusive – During an interview (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recalled (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA air card while on personal travel but (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used it for business purposes as well, i.e. checking (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA email and checking on office activity (no further information). According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on more than one

occasion (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) gave (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) permission to take (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA air card with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on personal travel so that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could keep up with office activity as well. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) said (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) referred (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to the information technology department for the specifics. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) learned about the excessive aircard charges (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) referred the incident to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) directors to handle, i.e. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and maybe (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could not recall who initially told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) about the incident. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) went on to say (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not aware of the actual amount of the charges on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA air card, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was never shown an air card bill, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) instructed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to handle the issue.

DISPOSITION: This investigation was able to support the allegation of violating PPP only. OSC recommended and conducted the corrective action of additional training for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) HR. Due to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) involvement in PPP, on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, the Agency made the final decision to suspend and debar (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) from future participation in federal government service.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) entered an Administrative Agreement with the Agency. The terms of the agreement are for 1 year, from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(F)

Since the Agency has taken all appropriate administrative actions as they deemed necessary in this investigation and previous investigations, this investigation is closed in the files of this office.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

TWO POTOMAC YARD
2733 SOUTH CRYSTAL DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

DATE: May 15, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2012-CAC-0123

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, DC	

VIOLATION(S):

1. 31 USC § 1342 – Limitation on Voluntary Services - An officer or employee of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia government may not accept voluntary services for either government or employ personal services exceeding that authorized by law except for emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.
2. 5 CFR § 2635.702 – Use of Public Office for Private Gain
3. 5 CFR § 2635.101(b)(7) – Basic obligation of Public Service – Employees shall not use public office for private gain
4. 5 CFR § 2635.101(b)(14) – Basic Obligation of Public Service – Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards.

ALLEGATIONS:

On May 8, 2012, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Washington, DC, reported potential grant fraud related to a \$250,000 OECA grant that was awarded to the Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development (IGSD), 2300 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 300B, Washington, DC. The OIG addressed the grant fraud allegations in another OI investigation.

During the course of the complaint stage, the OIG developed information that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Washington, DC allegedly allowed

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

IGSD to pay for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip to an (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference. Additionally, review of subpoenaed documents revealed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had allegedly asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for an internship for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

The allegations investigated by the OIG regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) were:

1. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allowed IGSD to pay for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip to attend an (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference;
2. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for an internship position for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); and
3. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) assisted at the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference held in Whistler, Canada.

FINDINGS:

In regards to the allegation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allowed IGSD to pay for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip to attend an (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference reviews of emails, as well as interviews conducted, failed to produce any evidence that supported this allegation. Between April 2011 and June 2011, there were various emails that appeared to contain travel information for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to the June 2011 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference in Whistler. Specifically, on May 13, 2011, American Airlines sent an e-ticket to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) flight to the conference. Review of the e-ticket appears to indicate that the ticket was paid for by an AAdvantage Certificate, which appeared to be American Airlines' frequent flyer program, and a Visa ending in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). On April 18, 2013, the OIG interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not receive any compensation from anyone for the work (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did at the conference. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) paid for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip to the conference. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received no payment from either IGSD or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip.

In regards to the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for an internship position for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on February 26, 2014, the OIG interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, DC seeking (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) opinion on the matter. In regards to the March 8, 2011 email that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) sent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5) initiated the contact, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) were "beholden" to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) believed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5)

With the current email, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and/or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could have said they felt coerced by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to give (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) an internship.

In regards to the allegation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) assisted at the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference held in Whistler, Canada, the results of several interviews with various EPA employees as well as a review of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) email supported that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) help at the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference, which was funded in part by an EPA cooperative agreement. Amongst the interviews conducted were two with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). On April 18, 2013, the OIG interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attended the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conference in Whistler. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attended the conference with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). As a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not comfortable leaving (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) then (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The conference took place during the summertime, possibly June, so (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not in school. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to help out while at the conference by doing things such as unpacking boxes and other grunt work. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was able to keep a close eye on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received feedback from others that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was behaving.

DISPOSITION: Unsupported, Supported; Closed.

Although the allegation that IGSD paid for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip to Whistler, Canada, was unsupported, it was supported that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did volunteer work at the conference and that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had asked for an internship for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

On May 8, 2014, the OIG presented to Loyaan Egal, Assistant United States Attorney, United States Attorney's Office (USAO), District of Columbia, 555 4th St, NW, Washington, DC, the matter of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allowing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to volunteer at an EPA-sponsored conference, a potential violation of 31 USC § 1342. Egal stated the matter was not one that his office would pursue.

On November 20, 2014, the OI presented a Report of Investigation to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Principle Deputy Assistant Administrator, EPA, Washington, DC, regarding the issues. On December 9, 2014, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) notified OI that on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2014, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was orally admonished (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) request to have (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) volunteer/intern at a conference funded through an EPA Cooperative Agreement. Additionally, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was instructed to meet with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for a full and complete understanding of 5 CFR 2635.702, which (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2014.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE, NW WJC WEST BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

REFERRED FOR ACTION REPORT OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) , (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, WASHINGTON, DC
OI-AR-2015-ADM-0065

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Narrative	Section A
Entities and Individuals	Section B
Prosecutive Status	Section C
Exhibits	

Distribution:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

With Attachments

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Informational Purposes Only – No Attachments

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Informational Purposes Only – No Attachments

Submitted by:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Special Agent
Office of Investigations

Approved by:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Office of Investigations

Reviewed by:

Patrick Sullivan
Assistant Inspector General
Office of Investigations

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

CASE NO.: OI-AR-2015-ADM-0065 **DATE OPENED:** 05/20/2015

CASE TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-12, **CASE AGENT(s):** (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 ENVIRONMENTAL
 PROTECTION AGENCY,
 WASHINGTON, DC

CASE CATEGORY: Employee Integrity **OFFICE:** Washington Field Office

JOINT AGENCIES: None **JURISDICTION:** Washington, DC

SECTION A - NARRATIVE

Introduction

On May 20, 2015, the Washington Field Office, Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Arlington, VA initiated an investigation based on EPA Hotline Complaint 2015-044. According to the complaint, EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA, Washington, DC or possibly (b) (6), spouse (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) misused (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA government travel credit card by making cash withdrawals for other than official purposes. (Exhibit 1)

During the course of this investigation, the OI developed information to believe (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had provided false information to OI investigators concerning who actually used (b) (6) government travel card.

The OIG determined there were four possible criminal and administrative violations that required investigation. The allegations investigated by the OIG were:

1. (b) (6), misrepresents (b) (6), as (b) (6), by utilizing the personal identification number (PIN) associated to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and withdrew funds.
2. (b) (6), provided false information to OI investigators by alleging (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) withdrew funds from (b) (6) government travel card.
3. (b) (6), misused (b) (6) official EPA government travel card.

Possible violation(s)

1. 18 U.S.C. § 1028 – Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information;
2. 18 U.S.C. § 1001 – False statement;
3. EPA Order 3120.1, EPA Conduct and Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #16 – Deliberate misrepresentation, falsification, concealment or withholding of a material fact, or refusal to testify or cooperate in an official proceeding;
4. EPA Office of the Chief Financial Officer Resource Management Directive System 2550B (Official Travel) Policy Manual.

Synopsis

Sufficient information was not developed to support that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) violated 18 U.S.C. § 1028 by misrepresenting (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and making cash withdrawals from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card.

Sufficient information was developed to support that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and EPA Order 3120.1, Appendix – Table of Penalties #16 by providing false information to OI investigators. Sufficient information was also developed to support that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) violated EPA Resource Management Directive System 2550B (Official Travel) by using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card for personal purchases.

On April 1, 2016, the investigation of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) providing false information to the EPA OIG was declined by the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Public Integrity Section, Washington, DC. Declination was based on factors to include (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5), (b) (7)(E)

Details

Investigation Disclosed Allegations Not Supported

Allegation 1: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) utilized (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA issued travel card and made multiple cash withdrawals.

Allegation 1 Findings: During a preliminary interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spouse, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had mistakenly utilized (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and made various cash withdrawals without (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knowledge. However, through subsequent interviews of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), various records reviews, and a second interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), it was determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not utilize (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) travel card.

Allegation 1 Investigative Results: On April 16, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had first learned of the questioned charges on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card after being contacted by the bank. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and confirmed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had made the cash withdrawals. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) didn't use (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card all the time therefore (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) kept the card at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) residence in a folder with other personal credit cards. The government travel card's PIN was written on a piece of paper and affixed to the travel card. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) accidentally used that card thinking it was one of their personal credit cards. (Exhibit 2)

On February 5, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) denied using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card adding that (b) (6) did not know (b) (6) was even issued one. (Exhibit 3) (b) (7)(C)

On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the bank statements for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review identified a total of nine questionable automated teller machine (ATM) cash withdrawals during the months of July 2014 through October 2014 as follows:

Trans Date	Amount	Location
7/3/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
7/10/2014	800.00	Chase, New York, NY
7/25/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/23/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Philadelphia, PA
9/8/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/15/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/22/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD

No cash withdrawals were noted during the month of June 2014 and no cash withdrawals were noted after the October 22, 2014 cash advance. Noted among the identified cash withdrawals was an \$800.00 cash withdrawal made in New York, NY on July 10, 2014. (Exhibit 4)

On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the July 2014 bank statement pertaining to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review determined (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) appeared to be on official travel in New York, NY during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014. (Exhibit 5)

Subsequent coordination with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management confirmed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to be on official travel to New York during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014.

On February 18, 2016, the OI reviewed the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). Specifically noted were (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) for July 10, 2014, which showed (b) (6) to have (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) multiple times throughout the day. (Exhibit 6) (b) (6)

On February 29 and again on March 11, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was telephonically reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) again denied ever using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and further stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to (b) (6) that (b) (6) used the card and made the questioned withdrawals. (Exhibit 7) (b) (6)

On March 10, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was questioned concerning the recently developed information where (b) (6) admitted that it was (b) (6) and not (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and made the questioned cash withdrawals. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recalled that (b) (6) may have used the money to pay bills and make random purchases. (Exhibit 8) (b) (6)

Investigation Disclosed Allegations Supported

Allegation 2: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided false information to OI investigators concerning who utilized (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA issued travel card.

Allegation 2 Findings: During a preliminary interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spouse, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had mistakenly utilized (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and made various cash withdrawals without (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knowledge. However, through subsequent interviews of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), various records reviews, and a second interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), it was determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not utilize (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) travel card. During the reinterview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided OI false information and that it was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) travel card for the cash withdrawals.

Allegation 2 Investigative Results: On April 16, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had first learned of the questioned charges on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card after being contacted by the bank. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and confirmed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had made the cash withdrawals. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) didn't use (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card all the time therefore (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) kept the card at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) residence in a folder with other personal credit cards. The government travel card's PIN was written on a piece of paper and affixed to the travel card. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) accidentally used that card thinking it was one of their personal credit cards. (Exhibit 2)

On February 5, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) denied using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card adding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not know (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was even issued one. (Exhibit 3)

On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the bank statements for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review identified a total of nine questionable automated teller machine (ATM) cash withdrawals during the months of July 2014 through October 2014 as follows:

Trans Date	Amount	Location
7/3/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
7/10/2014	800.00	Chase, New York, NY
7/25/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/23/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Philadelphia, PA
9/8/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/15/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/22/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD

No cash withdrawals were noted during the month of June 2014 and no cash withdrawals were noted after the October 22, 2014 cash advance. Noted among the identified cash withdrawals was an \$800.00 cash withdrawal made in New York, NY on July 10, 2014. (Exhibit 4)

On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the July 2014 bank statement pertaining to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review determined (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) appeared to be on official travel in New York, NY during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014. (Exhibit 5)

Subsequent coordination with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management confirmed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to be on official travel to New York during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014.

On February 18, 2016, the OI reviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E). Specifically noted were (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) for July 10, 2014, which showed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) multiple times throughout the day. (Exhibit 6)

On February 29 and again on March 11, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was telephonically reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) again denied ever using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and further stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used the card and made the questioned withdrawals. (Exhibit 7)

On March 10, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was questioned concerning the recently developed information where (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that it was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and not (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recalled that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) may have used the money to pay bills and make random purchases. (Exhibit 8)

Allegation 3: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) misused (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA issued Government travel card.

Allegation 3 Findings: During the reinterview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had made cash withdrawals with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and made personal purchases. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Allegation 3 Investigative Results: On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the bank statements for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review identified a total of nine questionable ATM cash withdrawals during the months of July 2014 through October 2014 as follows:

Trans Date	Amount	Location
7/3/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
7/10/2014	800.00	Chase, New York, NY
7/25/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Largo, MD
8/23/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Philadelphia, PA
9/8/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/4/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/15/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD
10/22/2014	803.00	Wells Fargo, Bowie, MD

No cash withdrawals were noted during the month of June 2014 and no cash withdrawals were noted after the October 22, 2014 cash advance. Noted among the identified cash withdrawals was an \$800.00 cash withdrawal made in New York, NY on July 10, 2014. (Exhibit 4)

On February 9, 2016, the OI reviewed the July 2014 bank statement pertaining to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card. Review determined (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) appeared to be on official travel in New York, NY during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014. (Exhibit 5)

Subsequent coordination with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management confirmed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to be on official travel to New York during the week of July 8, 2014 through July 13, 2014.

On February 29 and again on March 11, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was telephonically reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) again denied ever using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and further stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used the card and made the questioned withdrawals. (Exhibit 7)

On March 10, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was reinterviewed. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was questioned concerning the recently developed information where (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that it was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and not (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card and made the questioned cash withdrawals. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recalled that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) may have used the money to pay bills and make random purchases. (Exhibit 8)

Disposition

This Report of Investigation is being referred to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Washington, DC for administrative remedies or actions deemed appropriate.

SECTION B – ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

Name of Person: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Title & Company: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA
Role: Subject
Business Address: US EPA, Ronald Reagan Building, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.,
 Rm (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Washington, DC 20004
Business Phone: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
EPA Employee: Yes

Name of Person: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Title & Company: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Role: Subject
Business Address: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Phone:
EPA Employee: No

SECTION C – PROSECUTIVE STATUS

This investigation was presented to the DOJ's Public Integrity Section, Washington, DC for the potential violation of Title 18 USC 1001 False statement; however, it was declined for acceptance based on factors to include (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5), (b) (7)(E)

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
1.	Case Initiation
2.	Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
3.	Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
4.	Review of Government Travel Card Bank Statements
5.	Review of July 2014 Government Travel Card Bank Statement
6.	Review of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E)
7.	Reinterviews of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
8.	Reinterview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

290 BROADWAY, ROOM 1520
NEW YORK, NY 10007

DATE: January 3, 2018

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2015-ADM-0065

CROSS REFERENCE #: COMP-2015-74

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-12, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
WASHINGTON, DC

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, DC Washington, DC	EPA Employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Employee

POTENTIAL VIOLATION(S):

1. 18 U.S.C. § 1028 – Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information
2. 18 U.S.C. § 1001 – False statement
3. EPA Order 3120.1, EPA Conduct and Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #16 – Deliberate misrepresentation, falsification, concealment or withholding of a material fact, or refusal to testify or cooperate in an official proceeding
4. EPA Office of the Chief Financial Officer Resource Management Directive System 2550B (Official Travel) Policy Manual

ALLEGATION:

On November 30, 2014, the Washington Field Office, Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Arlington, VA received EPA Hotline Complaint 2015-044. According to the complaint, EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA, Washington, DC may have misused (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government issued travel credit card, possibly by allowing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spouse, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), make automatic teller machine withdrawals.

During the course of this investigation information was developed to suggest (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) may have provided false information concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), using (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) government travel card.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

FINDINGS:

Multiple document reviews and interviews were conducted which developed information to suggest (b) (6) provided false information concerning the use of (b) (6) government travel card.

On two occasions (b) (6) was interviewed. (b) (6) initially stated that (b) (6) had first learned of the questioned charges on (b) (6) government travel card after being contacted by the bank. (b) (6) related that (b) (6) had spoken with (b) (6) and confirmed that (b) (6) had made the cash withdrawals. (b) (6) stated that (b) (6) accidentally used the card thinking it was one of their personal credit cards. However, after continued investigation, (b) (6) was reinterviewed where (b) (6) admitted that it was (b) (6) and not (b) (6) who used (b) (6) government travel card and made the questioned cash withdrawals. (b) (6) recalled that (b) (6) may have used the money to pay bills and make random purchases.

DISPOSITION: Not Supported; Supported; Closed

Sufficient information was not developed to support (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) violated 18 U.S.C. § 1028, as alleged. Sufficient information was developed to support (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), misused (b) (6) government travel card, as well as provided false information to EPA management and EPA OIG investigators.

On April 1, 2016, this investigation was presented to the Public Integrity Section of the U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC for criminal prosecution but was declined.

On September 27, 2016, a report of investigation concerning this inquiry was provided to the Deputy Director, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Washington, DC for any action deemed appropriate. This office was subsequently notified that on April 18, 2017, a Notice of Proposed Removal, citing a lack of candor and misuse of the government travel card, was provided to (b) (6). On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (6) resigned from (b) (6) EPA position.

As all investigative steps have been taken this investigation is closed in this office.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 200042

DATE: March 21, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-AR-2015-CAC-0099

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-13, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, D.C.	

VIOLATION(S):

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 641	Public money, property or records
Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1001	False statements
EPA Table of Offenses and Penalties 12	Use of official authority or information for private gain

ALLEGATION:

On June 5, 2015, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), Washington Field Office, was referred EPA OIG Hotline complaint 2015-252 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), reported that a detective from the Maryland Transit Administration Police (MTA) called and stated there was evidence of an EPA employee selling their MARC train tickets. The Reporting Agent met with MTA Detective (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and reviewed the evidence presented by MTA, including the seized MARC tickets. The EPA employee was identified as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

FINDINGS:

Coordination with MTA Police and a subject interview were conducted, both of which resulted in information which supported the allegation. The subject prepared a sworn statement which was given to EPA's Labor and Employee Relations (LER) division.

DISPOSITION: Supported; Closed

On August 14, 2015, the case was presented to presented to an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) for the District of Maryland. The case was declined by the AUSA because (b) (5), (b) (7)(E) The Reporting Agent provided EPA's LER with the sworn

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

statement and pages from a MTA Police report. LER charged (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) with Conduct Unbecoming of a Federal Employee which resulted in (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) receiving a 10 day suspension from pay and duty and an indefinite suspension of (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) transit subsidy benefits. Since all appropriate criminal and administrative remedies have been taken this case is now closed.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON BUILDING
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20460

DATE: SEPTEMBER 2, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2012-CFR-0180

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-AR-2014-ADM-0090

TITLE: [REDACTED] SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, DC	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

VIOLATIONS:

- Title 5 CFR Subpart G § 2635.704 - Use of Government Property
- Title 5 CFR Subpart G § 2635.705(a)-(b) - Use of Official Time
- Title 5 CFR §2635.501 (a) - Impartiality in the performance of official duties

ALLEGATIONS: On April 19, 2013, Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED] (Case Agent) of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), 1200 Pennsylvania, Ave NW Washington, DC 20460, received information that [REDACTED] Senior Executive Service, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] maybe involved in the following employee misconduct:

1. [REDACTED] while on duty and while using [REDACTED] government workspace, sold products from three of [REDACTED] personally owned businesses, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] sold [REDACTED] products to [REDACTED] EPA subordinates and EPA colleagues.
2. [REDACTED] misused EPA resources, such as [REDACTED] office space, laptop, blackberry, and EPA Email account, in furtherance of [REDACTED] business activities related to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED].
3. In 2012, [REDACTED] had knowledge that [REDACTED], [REDACTED], a summer intern in the EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED], received two EPA performance cash awards totaling approximately \$790 dollars, with funds that originated directly from [REDACTED] operating budget.
4. [REDACTED] recommended a "best" friend ([REDACTED]) and a business acquaintance ([REDACTED])

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

for employment to contractor [REDACTED] was awarded a contract from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to conduct work for [REDACTED] program office.

5. Soon after [REDACTED] awarded the contract, a few months later they made a request for an additional \$1.2 million. Allegedly, [REDACTED] directed the Contracting Officer (CO) to approve [REDACTED] request.
6. [REDACTED] influenced and acted as the approving official for many of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) summer interns, to include [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. In 2012, (b) (6), (b) (7) had a personal relationship with [REDACTED].

FINDINGS:

John Reeder, EPA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Washington, DC, made the final decision to remove [REDACTED] from employment with the EPA, effective (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015.

In the final written decision, Reeder cited the following charges:

Supported - Charge I. One specification of misuse of EPA's e-mail system;

Supported - Charge II. One specification of misuse of official time;

Supported - Charge III. Fifteen specifications of misuse of position;

Not Supported - Charge IV. Five specifications of conducting personal business activities on Government property;

Not Supported - Charge V. One specification of negligent performance of duties;

Not Supported - Charge VI. Five specifications of failing to report a position held outside of the U.S. Government.

DISPOSITION: Final Removal

This investigation was able to support that several administrative violations did occur. Additionally, on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015, the Agency made the final decision to remove [REDACTED] from employment at the EPA.

[REDACTED] is currently appealing [REDACTED] removal via the Merit System Protection Board. Since the Agency took all appropriate administrative actions as they deemed necessary, this investigation is closed in the files of this office.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2013-ADM-0125

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, D.C.	

VIOLATION:

1. EPA Policy Number 2540-08-P1- Time and Attendance Reporting
2. EPA Order 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix-Table of Penalties #16: Deliberate misrepresentation, falsification, concealment or withholding of material fact, or refusal to testify or cooperate in an official proceeding
3. EPA Order 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix-Table of Penalties #27: Forging or falsifying official Government records or documents

ALLEGATION: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

knowingly approved or authorized the approval of fraudulent time and attendance and travel vouchers, and bonuses for John C. Beale (Beale), Policy Advisor, OAR, from 2000 to 2012. Additionally, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made false statements to investigators during the investigation into Beale.

FINDINGS:

The investigation substantiated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not exercise due diligence with respect to the authorization and approval of Beale's time and attendance records and travel authorization (TA) and vouchers, and that this failure permitted Beale to carry out, unchecked, extensive time and attendance and travel voucher fraud. Specifically, the investigation disclosed that, from 2005 to 2007, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to exercise due diligence and permitted the authorization and approval of \$65,721.87 in excessive, improper, or fraudulent travel vouchers for Beale. Additionally, the investigation disclosed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to ensure accurate and complete time and attendance records for Beale from 2000 to 2010 even though (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was aware of Beale's frequent absences from work and knew of his claims of working for the CIA.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

The investigation also disclosed that, during an interview conducted on June 18, 2013, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) initially denied having spoken to other witnesses, but then admitted to it after having been confronted with the facts to the contrary.

DISPOSITON:

On April 17, 2014, EPA OIG issued a Report of Investigation regarding this investigation to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

As a result of OIG's ongoing investigation into employee misconduct by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retired from Federal service on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015. No administrative action was taken against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) prior to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retirement from Federal service.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: APRIL 28, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AR-2013-ADM-0068

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	WASHINGTON, DC	

POTENTIAL VIOLATION(S): Misuse of Government Equipment, Inappropriate Conduct at Work, Misuse of Official Time in violation of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Order CIO 2102.0, *Policy on Limited Personal Use of Government Equipment*, (April 2, 2004)(Tab B).

ALLEGATION(S): [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] downloaded and viewed pornographic images on [REDACTED] EPA laptop while at work.

FINDING: The allegation that [REDACTED] downloaded and viewed pornographic images on [REDACTED] EPA computer while at work is supported.

On March 10, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of [REDACTED]

On March 13, 2015, the OIG provided EPA senior leadership with a final summary memorandum report for this investigation. On March 24, 2015, Acting Assistant Administrator [REDACTED] informed the OIG that the EPA had submitted a letter of proposed removal to [REDACTED] due to the OIG's investigation.

[REDACTED] retired from federal service effective (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015

DISPOSITION: Since this case has been criminally declined and there is no administrative nexus, this case is closed with no further action. However, if additional information is obtained, OI will assess such information and take appropriate action.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

TWO POTOMAC YARD
2733 SOUTH CRYSTAL DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

DATE: June 5, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0019

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-11 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-11 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Washington, DC	

VIOLATION(S):

1. Conducting personal affairs while on duty
2. Violation of Flexiplace agreement

ALLEGATIONS:

On November 22, 2013, the OI received allegations that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was a low performing employee. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

In 2011, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) requested (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), which were granted in 2012 in the form of full-time telework. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had a history of not accounting for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time in People Plus correctly and not meeting the performance standards and objectives for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) position. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had been placed on a Performance Assessment Plan (PAP), the PAP has had no impact on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) meeting the performance goals and objectives of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) position.

FINDINGS:

The results of interviews, review of documents, and surveillance concluded that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was performing personal business during time (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) claimed to be teleworking for the EPA. Furthermore, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to OI that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) frequently conducted personal business during (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) flexiplace hours.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

DISPOSITION: Supported; Closed.

On April 17, 2015, United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Maryland declined to prosecute under 18 USC 641 due to (b) (5), (b) (7)(E).

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, the EPA terminated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) based to the OI's findings.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: NOVEMBER 02, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0082

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, D.C.	

BACKGROUND: On Friday May 2, 2014, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) spoke with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

regarding an allegation of employee misconduct involving (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Specifically, on Thursday April 24, 2014, (b) (6) was witnessed viewing pornographic material on (b) (6) government laptop during core work hours by a minor who was in the building for the EPA's (b) (6) "Bring Your Daughters and Sons to Work Day."

VIOLATION: EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #7: Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful.

ALLEGATION: On May 2, 2014, the EPA OIG received a complaint alleging employee misconduct involving (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Specifically, on Thursday April 24, 2014, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was allegedly witnessed viewing pornography on (b) (6) government laptop during core work hours by a minor who was in the building for the EPA's (b) (6) "Bring Your Daughters and Sons to Work Day." On February 23, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of this case making it a purely administrative matter.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

FINDINGS: Sufficient evidence existed to support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) misused government time and resources by viewing and organizing pornography on an EPA computer during scheduled working hours in violation of EPA policy.

DISPOSITON:

On March 23, 2015, a Proposal Notice for Removal was sent to (b) (6) and on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015, (b) (6) was officially removed from employment with the EPA. After termination, (b) (6) filed a complaint regarding (b) (6) removal with the Merit Systems Protection Board, but (b) (6) withdrew that complaint with prejudice as of July 13, 2015.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 22, 2015

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0109

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: JUTRO, PETER, SES, ACTING ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, EPA OFFICE OF
HOMELAND SECURITY

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
JUTRO, PETER; [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	WASHINGTON, D.C.	

VIOLATION:

1. EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #7:
Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously
disgraceful.
2. EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #32:
Sexual harassment of EPA employees.
3. EPA Guidelines for Visitors and Groups.
4. Executive Order 10450, Section 8-Security Requirements for Government Employment.
5. Executive Order 13526, Section 4.1-Classified National Security Information.
6. EPA Anti-Harassment Policy, <http://intranet.epa.gov/civilrights/antiharassment-policy.htm>
7. Principle Number 11 of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive
Branch, 5 C.F.R. Part 2635
8. Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

ALLEGATION:

1. From July 16 to July 30, 2014, Peter Jutro, Acting Associate Administrator (Acting AA),
Office of Homeland Security, engaged in a series of interactions, including conduct and
verbal exchanges of a sexual nature, involving a twenty-one (21) year old female intern
from the Smithsonian Institution who reported the interactions to her supervisor at the
Smithsonian Institution and indicated that she was “uncomfortable and scared” by their
interactions (Victim 1).

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

2. In addition to actions directed at Victim 1, from 2004 through July 2014, Jutro engaged in conduct and exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, considered to be unwelcome by sixteen (16) additional females.
3. Jutro was not in compliance with building entry security procedures.
4. Jutro discussed classified information in violation of safeguarding and access restriction requirements either in an unsecure location or in a careless manner.
5. Whether a lack of due diligence by senior level officials at EPA in responding to earlier claims of unwelcome conduct and verbal exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, violated any mandate to take action, thereby resulting in additional women being subjected to inappropriate behavior by Jutro from January 2014 to July 30, 2014.

FINDINGS:

The investigation substantiated that from July 16 to July 30, 2014, Jutro engaged in a series of interactions, including some of a sexual nature, involving Victim 1 who reported the interactions to her supervisor at the Smithsonian Institution and indicated that she was "uncomfortable and scared" by their interactions. Additionally, the investigation substantiated that from 2004 through July 2014, Jutro engaged in conduct and exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, considered to be unwelcome by sixteen (16) additional females. For the third allegation, the investigation substantiated that Jutro was not in compliance with building entry security procedures by bypassing the security checkpoint with Victim 1 and not having her sign in as a visitor. For the fourth allegation, the investigation determined that the allegation that Jutro discussed classified information in violation of federal requirements for safeguarding and restricting access to classified information was unsubstantiated.

Lastly, the investigation substantiated that senior level officials at EPA received information regarding multiple claims of unwelcome conduct and verbal exchanges by Jutro. The investigation further substantiated that those officials did not take any action against Jutro as a result of receiving this information about Jutro. Subsequent to these officials receiving information about the actions by Jutro, six additional (6) women were subjected to behavior they felt was inappropriate by Jutro. Specifically, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] were advised prior to or immediately following Jutro's selection as Acting AA for OHS, in February 2014 that Jutro exhibited inappropriate behavior toward women. [REDACTED] reported this information to the other senior level officials, but none of the others took any action. On February 23, 2014, Jutro was designated the Acting AA for OHS until he was placed on paid administrative leave on August 4, 2014.

As discussed in the second Report of Investigation, the OIG examined whether there was any requirement that the senior officials who were made aware of Jutro's actions had a duty to take any specific action as a result of that knowledge, including reporting that information to OIG. In particular, the OIG examined whether their inaction violated any ethical regulations or the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, or breached the EPA's anti-harassment policy. The investigation did not substantiate a violation of any duty by any of these senior officials to act on the information they had received regarding Jutro. However, OIG's investigation was negatively

impacted and delayed due to the fact that these senior level officials did not notify OIG about their knowledge of other incidents of Jutro's inappropriate behavior toward women.

DISPOSITON:

On March 4, 2015 and April 24, 2015, EPA OIG issued two Report of Investigation regarding this investigation to Stan Meiburg (Meiburg), Acting Deputy Administrator.

As a result of OIG's ongoing investigation into employee misconduct by Jutro, Jutro retired from Federal service on January 9, 2015. No administrative action was taken against Jutro prior to his retirement from Federal service.

On July 14, 2015, Meiburg sent email to Patrick Sullivan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, responding to the second Report of Investigation for this investigation. Meiburg states that he disagreed with the findings in the second ROI and provides no evidence to suggest that administrative action will be taken based upon the OIG findings for this report.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON BUILDING
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20460

DATE: July 21, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-CAC-0087

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2014-CAC-0122
AND OI-AR-2014-ADM-0090

TITLE: [REDACTED], GS 13, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED]

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	William Jefferson Clinton [REDACTED], 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, DC 20004	

VIOLATION: Title 5 U.S.C. § 2308(b) (6) – Prohibited Personnel Practices; Title 5 CFR 2635.501 (a) (b) - Impartiality in the performance of official duties

ALLEGATIONS:

Approximately August 20, 2014, during the investigation of another case (#OI-HQ-2012-CFR-0180), Special Agent [REDACTED] (Case Agent) of the United States EPA, Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), 1200 Pennsylvania, Ave NW Washington, DC 20460, conducted an investigation related to, from 2006 through 2012, several EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees allegedly engaged in Prohibited Personnel Practices (PPP). The Case Agent reviewed email files which indicated potential new hires' resumes were intentionally altered, as well as position descriptions (PDs) intentionally altered to match new hires' resumes.

The Case Agent also learned that allegedly, in 2012, [REDACTED] may have had direct involvement in the hiring of [REDACTED] in the EPA's Student Temporary Employment Program (STEP).

While investigating the alleged PPP, the Case Agent observed what appeared to be discrepancies on the 2012 EPA Forms – "3130-1a, Recommendation for Incentive Recognition", where [REDACTED], [REDACTED], EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) , may have repeatedly inappropriately signed as the Obliging Official and obligating funds to pay out cash awards for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], which caused an impact dollar loss to the EPA in the amount of \$2020.

FINDINGS:

On November 12, 2014, the Case Agent presented to Seth Waxman, DOJ, AUSA, located at 555 4th Street, NW, Washington, DC., for [REDACTED] allegedly violating criminal statute - Title 18 USC §208 - Acts affecting a personal financial interest. On December 4, 2014, the AUSA declined acceptance for criminal prosecution.

On December 8, 2014, in regards to the PPP violations, since the nature of the investigation fell directly under the purview of the Office of Special Counsel (OSC); therefore a referral for action was made to their office in Washington, DC.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) , 2014, while under investigation, [REDACTED] voluntarily resigned from the EPA. Upon leaving the Agency, [REDACTED] received a separation incentive payout of \$25,000, under the Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments.

On August 13, 2015, Case Agent received a closure letter notification from [REDACTED], Office of Special Counsel (OSC), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) . OSC concluded that violation 5 U.S.C. § 2308(b) (6)- Prohibited Personnel Practices did occurred and that the best corrective action was an OSC administered training session on prohibited personnel practices. The training occurred on July 29, 2015 (no further information) and subsequently OSC closed MA-15-1473 and took no further action.

Allegation 1:

It was alleged that [REDACTED] was involved in altering and / or had knowledge that PDs and resumes were being altered to assist new employees with obtaining employment with the EPA. These positions included paid intern positions, full time employment and promotions within the EPA.

Supported - During the September 16, 2014, interview [REDACTED] was advised of [REDACTED] Garrity Rights and Advisement Warnings. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] understanding of [REDACTED] rights and then signed and dated the Garrity Acknowledgment of Rights form. [REDACTED] voluntarily signed a prepared sworn statement and admitted to, helping intern students and potential new hires gain full time employment with the EPA, by altering resumes in 2007, 2010, and 2012. [REDACTED] admitted to forwarding PDs to intern students and EPA potential new hires. [REDACTED] admitted to sending ‘buzz words’ to intern students and EPA potential new hires. There are at least four (4) instances where [REDACTED] had knowledge of and / or was directly involved with altering resumes and PDs:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Allegation 2:

In 2012, [REDACTED] may have had direct involvement in the hiring of [REDACTED] in the EPA's STEP program.

Supported – During the September 16, 2014, interview [REDACTED] acknowledged to participating in [REDACTED], hiring process during the summer of 2012. [REDACTED] admitted to initiating the paper work for [REDACTED] to verify [REDACTED] enrollment at the university, which was a requirement for EPA's STEP program. [REDACTED] admitted to on or about May 1-2, 2012, making contact with [REDACTED], as an EPA Official, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] admitted to using [REDACTED] EPA Office work address, office title, work contact number, work facsimile number and listed [REDACTED] on the paper work as a point of contact and representative for EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). [REDACTED] stated on May 31, 2012 and June 1, 2012, the Cincinnati, Office of Human Resources, Shared Services Center (Cincy), emailed [REDACTED] regarding [REDACTED] hiring process. Finally, documents were obtained that showed on June 4, 2012, [REDACTED]'s SF 52 as an office point of contact

Allegation 3:

It was alleged [REDACTED] signed as the obligating official for [REDACTED] performance cash awards, and also signed as the obligation official for [REDACTED]'s performance cash awards. Allegedly this occurred once in 2010 for [REDACTED] in the amount of \$250, and several times in 2012 for [REDACTED] in the amount of \$1770.

Supported - During the September 16, 2014, interview [REDACTED] acknowledged on August 6, 2010, [REDACTED] verified that the funds were in the program office's budget for [REDACTED]'s cash award. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] signed the cash award form as the Obligating Official. [REDACTED] admitted forwarding the form to Cincy for processing and Cincy made the final distribution. [REDACTED] claimed [REDACTED] was a part of a Team Award and all the intern students received the same amount, \$250.

During the interview, [REDACTED] acknowledged that on August 8, 2012, [REDACTED] verified that the funds were in the program office's budget for [REDACTED]'s cash award. [REDACTED] admitted [REDACTED] signed the form as the Obligating Official, and then [REDACTED] forwarded the forms to Cincy for processing and Cincy made final distribution. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] was awarded an On-The-Spot Award in the amount \$250.

During the interview, [REDACTED] acknowledged that [REDACTED] signed [REDACTED] own cash awards. [REDACTED] recalled, on August 8, 2012, [REDACTED] verified that the funds were in the program office's budget for [REDACTED] cash award. [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] signed the form as the Obligating Official on [REDACTED] own cash award form. [REDACTED] admitted to forwarding the form to Cincy for processing and Cincy made the final distribution, subsequently [REDACTED] was awarded a Superior Accomplishment Award in the amount \$575. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] was awarded a Superior Accomplishment Award on

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 3

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

October 6, 2012, in the amount of \$695. However, after reviewing the form, [REDACTED] opined that, that was not [REDACTED] hand writing on the form in the Obligating Official box. [REDACTED] recalled receiving the monetary award but maintained that was not [REDACTED] signature. The OIG OI Agents also showed [REDACTED] another form which indicates that [REDACTED] was awarded a 40 hour Time-Off Award on November 14, 2012. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] name was typed in as the Obligating Official, but this form is not signed. [REDACTED] recalled receiving the 40 hours' time off, but I could not explain why it is not signed.

DISPOSITION: All three (3) allegation were supported.

The investigation found sufficient information to support the allegations made against [REDACTED]. In addition, as of August 13, 2015, the OSC concluded that PPP did occur and issued the corrective action of training. On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2014, while under investigation, [REDACTED] voluntarily resigned from the EPA. Upon leaving the Agency, [REDACTED] received a separation incentive payout of \$25,000, under the Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments. As such, no further investigative activity is anticipated. This investigation is closed in the files of this office.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON BUILDING
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20460

DATE: July 15, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-CAC-0122

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2014-CAC-0087
AND OI-AR-2014-ADM-0090

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED], 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, DC 20004	

VIOLATION: 5 U.S.C. § 2308(b) (6) – Prohibited Personnel Practices

ALLEGATION:

Approximately August 20, 2014, during the investigation of another case (#OI-HQ-2012-CFR-0180), Special Agent [REDACTED] (Case Agent) of the United States EPA, Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), 1200 Pennsylvania, Ave NW Washington, DC 20460, found an email i (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] EPA email account which alleged that in 2006 [REDACTED] and other EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] employees may have repeatedly violated prohibited personnel practices. [REDACTED] and others allegedly altered and / or had knowledge that a position description (PD) for a General Schedule, Grade 9, Program Analyst position was being changed to match the resume of a potential candidate named [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was seeking full time employment via the EPA's Federal Intern Career Program. Subsequently, [REDACTED]'s altered PD was forwarded to [REDACTED], a non EPA employee, and social acquaintance and business partner of former [REDACTED]

A further review of [REDACTED]'s and [REDACTED] EPA email account produced additional emails which indicated from 2006 to 2012, [REDACTED], with [REDACTED] knowledge, altered resumes and changed

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

PDs several times to give others an unfair advantage when seeking employment with the EPA. This included people seeking paid intern positions, full time employment, as well as current EPA employees competing for promotions.

The nature of the investigation fell directly under the purview of the Office of Special Counsel (OSC); therefore a referral for action was made to their office in Washington, DC.

FINDINGS: On August 13, 2015, Case Agent received a closure letter notification from [REDACTED], Attorney, Office of Special Counsel (OSC), Investigation and Prosecution Division, 1730 M Street NW, Ave, Washington, DC. Contact (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). OSC concluded that violation 5 U.S.C. § 2308(b) (6)- Prohibited Personnel Practices did occur and that the best corrective action was an OSC administered training session on prohibited personnel practices. The training occurred on July 29, 2015 (no further information) and subsequently OSC closed MA-15-1473 and took no further action.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, the EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) decided to take further action and issued a Letter of Reprimand to [REDACTED] for inappropriate conduct based on the following:

"This is a notice that you are officially reprimanded for Inappropriate Conduct. The specific facts supporting this reprimand are as follows:

During an Office of Inspector General (OIG) investigation, you admitted to engaging in Prohibited Personnel Practices (PPPs), defined under 5 U.S.C.' §2302 (b) (6) which states that it is a PPP to "grant any preference or advantage not authorized by law, rule, or regulation to any employee or applicant for employment (including defining the scope or manner of competition or the requirements for any position) for the purpose of improving or injuring the prospects of any particular person for employment." Specifically, you admitted to inappropriately altering Position Description s (PDs) and resumes to assist applicants in gaining employment with the EPA".

Allegation:

It was alleged that [REDACTED] was involved in altering and / or had knowledge that PDs and resumes were being altered to assist new employees with obtaining employment with the EPA. These positions included paid intern positions, full time employment and promotions within the EPA.

Supported - During the September 9, 2014, interview [REDACTED] was advised of [REDACTED] Garrity Rights and Advisement Warnings. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] understanding of [REDACTED] rights and then signed and dated the Garrity Acknowledgment of Rights form. [REDACTED] voluntarily signed a prepared sworn statement and admitted to, from 2006 through 2012, altering resumes of potential new hires who were trying to gain full time employment with the EPA. [REDACTED] admitted to altering

PDs to fit resumes when certain new hires were trying to gain full time employment with the EPA. [REDACTED] stated that several EPA Directors had knowledge of what [REDACTED] was doing, i.e. altering resumes of potential new hires. In fact, [REDACTED] admitted several EPA Directors even asked [REDACTED] directly to alter PDs and resumes to fit a particular person or persons' resume(s). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) said, "[REDACTED] (removed from employment in 2015), [REDACTED] (retired from EPA), [REDACTED] (retired from EPA) [REDACTED] (retired from EPA) and [REDACTED] (retired from EPA)".

[REDACTED] further stated, *"This was the culture at the EPA back then, managers would have a particular person in mind that they wanted to bring on-board and they would ask for my assistance. Even though I did not have much experience in HR people would come to me for assistance because I knew how to put the recruitment packages together and I was familiar with the documents that needed to be in the recruitment packages. In my opinion today, this type of prohibited activity no longer goes on at the EPA"*.

DISPOSITION: The allegation is supported.

The investigation found sufficient information to support the allegation made against [REDACTED]. In addition, as of August 13, 2015, the OSC concluded that PPP did occur and issued the corrective action of training. On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, EPA OARM office issued a Letter of Reprimand to [REDACTED] for violating PPP. As such, no further investigative activity is anticipated. This investigation is closed in the files of this office.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: MARCH 14, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0044

CROSS REFERENCE #: COMP-2015-37

TITLE: [REDACTED], GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	GS-15, WASHINGTON, D.C.	

VIOLATION:

18 U.S.C. § 1001(a) – Statements or entries generally – False statements
5 C.F.R. Part 2635 - Standards of ethical conduct for employees of the executive branch: Subpart H – Outside Activities

ALLEGATION:

On November 7, 2014, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations, Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received an EPA Office of Inspector General Hotline complaint alleging (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[REDACTED] EPA, had outside employment that was not documented on [REDACTED] previously submitted and signed Confidential Financial Disclosure Report (OGE Form 450). The complaint also alleged [REDACTED]'s outside employment position may be a conflict of interest with [REDACTED] position as an EPA employee due to the fact that [REDACTED] EPA position requires international travel, which may also be related to travel for [REDACTED] outside employment.

FINDINGS:

Concerning the first allegation, there is sufficient evidence to support that [REDACTED] had outside employment, as defined in the OGE Form 450, with a nonprofit organization called [REDACTED]. This employment was not approved by the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] designated Ethics Official; and, [REDACTED] neglected to list [REDACTED] position with [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] signed OGE Form 450 for years 2009 to 2014.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

The second allegation, however, which was that [REDACTED]'s international travel for official EPA business included travel for personal and/or outside employment purposes, is unfounded. Specifically, [REDACTED] is a domestic non-profit organization, which [REDACTED] in the Washington, District of Columbia metropolitan area.

DISPOSITION:

On November 20, 2015, the facts of the case were presented to The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, regarding the stated allegations for potential violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a). The Fraud and Public Corruption Section (FPCS) declined federal prosecution of [REDACTED] based on the facts of the case. The FPCS approved the EPA to take whatever administrative actions EPA deems necessary, if appropriate. As such, this EPA OIG case was solely administrative in nature.

On January 29, 2016, the EPA OIG issued a Final Summary Report for this investigation to Stan Meiburg, Acting Deputy Administrator, EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Assistant Administrator, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, and [REDACTED], Office of General Counsel, EPA.

On February 25, 2016, [REDACTED] responded to the EPA OIG Final Summary Report via memorandum to Arthur Elkins, Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, EPA. In the memorandum, [REDACTED] advised the OIG that [REDACTED] had resigned from the EPA, effective on [REDACTED] 2016. As a result of [REDACTED]'s resignation, no administrative action was taken by the [REDACTED] however, did advise that the [REDACTED] Immediate Office of the Assistant Administrator was evaluating whether the case necessitates updates to their current ethics training.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: JUNE 19, 2017

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0074

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION:

18 U.S.C. § 641: Theft of Public Money, Property or Records

ALLEGATION:

On May 27, 2015, the Office of Professional Responsibility, Office of Investigations, Office of Inspector General (OIG), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received an EPA OIG Hotline complaint reporting potential employee misconduct by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA. Specifically, the complaint alleged that on numerous occasions, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) notified staff via email that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) would be out of the office on leave, but (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not record (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leave taken in PeoplePlus. An investigation was initiated to identify if (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) committed time and attendance fraud.

FINDINGS:

There was sufficient evidence to support the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) improperly recorded (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance. On August 21, 2015, during an interview with OIG special agents, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made admissions and provided explanations as to why (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recorded time away from the office in non-duty status as regular EPA work hours.

DISPOSITION:

On September 1, 2015, this case was presented to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. The Fraud and Public Corruption Section declined federal prosecution of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and indicated that the EPA may take administrative action as it deems appropriate.

On December 10, 2016, the EPA OIG issued a Final Summary Report regarding this investigation to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA,

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Chief of Staff, Office of the Administrator, EPA and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Associate General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, EPA.

On January 24, 2017, the EPA issued a Notice of Proposed Suspension to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for twenty-one (21) calendar days. On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) began the twenty-one (21) day suspension.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DEC 10 2015

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT

SUBJECT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Case Number: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0074

FROM: Patrick F. Sullivan
Assistant Inspector General for Investigations
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Office of Inspector General (OIG)

TO: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(With Attachments)

Matthew Fritz
Chief of Staff
Office of the Administrator (OA)
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
(Without Attachments)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Associate General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
(Without Attachments)

This final summary report sets forth the EPA OIG's investigative finding for your review concerning the above referenced case. This report includes the eleven investigative documents used in our review,¹ which will also be relevant to your review process in determining whether administrative action is warranted.

As background, on May 27, 2015, the EPA OIG received a complaint alleging that on numerous occasions (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) notified staff via email that (b) (6) would be out of the office on leave, (b) (6)

¹ Due to the large number of pages in the relevant attachments, the EPA OIG will provide a CD with digital copies of the attachments contained within a memorandum of activity.

but then did not record (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leave taken in PeoplePlus.² We initiated an investigation into whether (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was committing time and attendance fraud.

On August 21, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by EPA OIG special agents. During this interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made admissions and provided explanations as to why (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had recorded time away from the office in non-duty status as regular EPA work hours. Specifically, during (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interview, special agents presented (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) with a spreadsheet listing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leave requests and/or leave notification emails and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) corresponding PeoplePlus records, which identified approximately 311 hours of regular time (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that should have been recorded as leave.³ In addition to the spreadsheet, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was also presented with samples of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leave email notifications, PeoplePlus records, and screenshots of email activity (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reviewed and initialed these documents during (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interview. Further, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) drafted a sworn statement concerning this matter, in which (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated, in part, "I am very concerned and upset about what I've learned today and I'm anxious to right this wrong."

Based upon the foregoing, there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) improperly recorded (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance.

On September 3, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for violations of 18 USC 641 – Public Money, Property, or Records. As such, this case is solely administrative. I am providing you with this Final Summary Report, along with supporting documentation, for your review and to enable the Agency to continue to take whatever administrative action is deemed appropriate.

My office is taking no further investigatory action in this matter; however, in order that we may satisfy our reporting requirement to Congress and the Administrator, please advise this office within 30 days of receipt of this Final Summary Report of the administrative action taken or proposed by you in this matter, if any. This final summary report is "For Official Use Only" and its disclosure to unauthorized individuals is prohibited. Portions of it may be used by appropriate officials for administrative action. Please return this report after your review of this matter is completed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 202-(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

ATTACHMENT

1. Memorandum of Activity – Final Summary Report Attachments

² PeoplePlus is EPA's automated online time and attendance system in which employees enter time and managers approve time through a secure web-based application.

³ The EPA OIG, in creating the spreadsheet presented to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was conservative in calculating the 311 hour estimate of time (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recorded as regular time when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) should have used leave. The EPA OIG only counted full work days of 8 or more scheduled hours. For example, the EPA OIG methodology excluded partial days where (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) appears to have arrived late or left early and did not use leave. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0072

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CASE AGENT (if different from prepared by):

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

NARRATIVE:

On May 27, 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General, (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), received a complaint alleging that on numerous occasions, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA Headquarters, Washington, DC notified staff via email that (b) (6) would be out of the office on leave, but then did not record (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leave taken in PeoplePlus. On August 21, 2015, EPA OIG special agents interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). During this interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made admissions, and also provided explanations, as to why (b) (6) had why (b) (6) had recorded time away from the office in non-duty status as regular EPA work hours when (b) (6) should have been charged leave. (6)

EPA OIG is submitting a final summary report to the EPA for this investigation. Below is a list of attachments relevant to the investigation. These files will be submitted on a CD with the final summary report.

ATTACHMENT(S)

1. May 28, 2015, Office of Inspector General Hotline Complaint 2015-234
2. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) PeoplePlus Records for Pay Period 1, 2013 to Pay Period 22, 2015
3. August 18, 2015 Memorandum of Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
4. August 21, 2015 signed Garrity Rights form for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
5. Scanned copy of documents shown to (b) (6), during 08/21/15 interview
6. Excel Table created by SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to illustrate leave emails and corresponding PeoplePlus records for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
7. August 21, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) handwritten Statement
8. August 25, 2015 Memorandum of Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
9. August 21, 2015 signed Garrity Rights form for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
10. Scanned copy of documents shown to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) during 08/21/15 interview
11. August 21, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) handwritten Statement

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

ATTACHMENT(S)

1. May 28, 2015, Office of Inspector General Hotline Complaint 2015-234



2015-234
referral.pdf

2. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) PeoplePlus Records for Pay Period 1, 2013 to Pay Period 22, 2015



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
PP 201301 to 201522

3. August 18, 2015 Memorandum of Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



MOI -

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

4. August 21, 2015 signed Garrity Rights form for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

yWarning-8-21-15.p

5. Scanned copy of documents shown to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) during 08/21/15 interview



Documentsshownt
d (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) during8-21ir

6. Excel Table created by SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to illustrate leave emails and corresponding PeoplePlus records for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Emailist-Disc
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) repencies.pdf

7. August 21, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) handwritten Statement



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) statem
ent-8-21-15.pdf

8. August 25, 2015 Memorandum of Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) MOI -
8-21-15 - MS!

9. August 21, 2015 signed Garrity Rights form for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
yWarning-8-21-15.p

10. Scanned copy of documents shown to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) during 08/21/15 interview



Documentsshownt
o (b) (6), (b) 8-21ir

11. August 21, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7) handwritten Statement



(b) (6), (b) Statem
ent-8-21-15.pdf



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0097

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION: Firearms Safety and Security Standards, OIG Procedure 204, Section 1.10

ALLEGATION: Subject left (b) service weapon unattended in a stall in the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) restroom at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

FINDINGS: On March 17, 2015, Subject was interviewed concerning leaving (b) duty weapon in the (b) restroom. During the interview the Subject admitted that (b) left (b) duty weapon unattended in a (b) (6), bathroom stall located (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and the Subject stated that there was not excuse for what happened.

DISPOSITION: A Management Inquiry was completed on May 9, 2015 that substantiated the allegation that the Subject left (b) duty weapon unattended in a (b) bathroom located in (b) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). As a result, a Notice of Proposed Suspension was provided to the Subject on May 27, 2015 with a recommendation of a five (5) suspension. As the deciding official, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations Patrick Sullivan, issued a Notice of Decision on Proposed Suspension to the Subject on July 21, 2015 mitigating the five (5) day suspension recommendation to a one (1) day suspension based upon the (b) (7)(E), (b) (5) (b) (7)(E), (b) (5). The Subject served the one (1) suspension on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2015.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: MARCH 30, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0112

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-13, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, D.C.	

VIOLATION:

EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #7: Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful.

Inappropriate use of EPA issued badge and credential for personal gain.

ALLEGATION:

On May 15, 2015, the Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), EPA initiated an investigation to determine if (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA was involved in employee misconduct in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) position as a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), during an altercation at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Monroe, GA 30656 on April 13, 2015. During this altercation, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allegedly used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) credentials and badge for personal gain.

FINDINGS:

OI conducted interviews and reviewed court documents which substantiated the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) credentials and badge for personal gain on April 15, 2015.

DISPOSITION:

On June 24, 2015, the facts of the investigation were presented to Assistant United States Attorney Kimberly Easterling (AUSA Easterling), United States Attorney's Office, Northern District of Georgia, for possible criminal persecution. After being presented with the facts of the investigation, AUSA Easterling indicated (b) (5) and the AUSA's office declined prosecution.

On October 13, 2015, EPA OIG issued a Final Summary Report regarding this investigation to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA.

On November 13, 2015, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) responded to the EPA OIG's Final Summary Report via memorandum to Patrick Sullivan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General. In the memorandum, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided the following correction actions (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) office made in light of the discovery that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA issued credential and badge for personal gain on April 13, 2015:

- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was verbally counseled on October 15, 2015
- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received an Memorandum of Counseling on November 13, 2015

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: NOVEMBER 6, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0133

CROSS REFERENCE #: COMP-2015-155

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
EPA

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

COMPLAINT:

On February 20, 2014, the EPA OIG Hotline received a complaint alleging employee misconduct by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) PA. Specifically, the complaint alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was engaging in time and attendance fraud, and that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retaliated against a subordinate employee.

BACKGROUND:

Subsequent to the case initiation, and after investigative review was conducted, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigation (OI), OIG, EPA, determined that the allegation of retaliation by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had been addressed by both (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management and the EPA's Conflict Resolution Specialist, Labor and Employee Relations (LER), Office of Human Resources (OHR), EPA. However, OPR identified two separate issues related to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance: first, did (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provide (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA username and password to a subordinate employee so that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could access (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA computer; and, second, did (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engage in time and attendance fraud.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

First, the allegation of whether (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA username and password to a subordinate employee so that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could access (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA computer is supported. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted to OIG Special Agents that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did provide (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA username and password to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), a former EPA employee, who at that time was a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) corroborated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) statement.

Second, concerning the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in time and attendance fraud, OIG Special Agents conducted multiple interviews and reviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) timesheets. Based upon the totality of the facts collected and reviewed, the evidence does not support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in time and attendance fraud.

RECOMMENDATION:

A Final Summary Report was provided to the EPA. A Letter of Reprimand, dated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2017, was issued to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). No further action was taken by the Agency.

This case is recommended for closure with no further investigatory action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: APRIL 5, 2018

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0007

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	N/A

COMPLAINT: On October 20, 2015, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) initiated an investigation on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), after discovering inconsistencies concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) actions related to the events surrounding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), injury. Based upon a review of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) case, as well as additional information independently obtained during the course this investigation, the OIG identified and investigated the following five (5) allegations:

1. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Government Owned Vehicle (GOV) in a manner contrary to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) policy by allowing a passenger (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who was not on official (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) duty, to travel in the vehicle.
2. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) took an entire trip, using a GOV, without authorization or an approved travel authorization, and, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never submitted a corresponding travel voucher. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip, during which (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) transported (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) radio equipment, went from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) duty station, to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), to the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) metro area, then to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), where (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) met (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and ultimately back to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).
3. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was involved in, or a witness to, an altercation that caused (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to sustain an injury to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) face and head.
4. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) improperly secured officially issued law enforcement equipment, to include (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) duty weapon, during (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stay at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

5. The GOV used by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on a regular basis incurred damage, to include a stolen tailgate, while in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) control and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not provide notification in accordance with applicable policy.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

Regarding allegation 1 - There is sufficient evidence to support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used a GOV in a manner contrary to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) policy by allowing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who was off-duty, to travel in the GOV (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was using.

Regarding allegation 2 - There is sufficient evidence to support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) took an entire trip, using a GOV, without authorization or an approved travel authorization, and, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never submitted a corresponding travel voucher. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) trip, during which (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) transported radio equipment, went from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) duty station, to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), to the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) metro area, then to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) where (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) me (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and ultimately back to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Regarding allegation 3 - Not supported. The evidence did not support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was involved in, or witnessed, an altercation that led to the injuries sustained by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Regarding allegation 4 - Not supported. The evidence does not support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stored (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) issued duty weapon in a manner inconsistent with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Policy.

Regarding allegation 5 - The allegation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not report damage to the GOV that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used on a regular basis is inconclusive. Although (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never completed the requisite Accident or Incident Reports, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) also states (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) notified (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) supervisor of damage done to the truck.

On June 2, 2016, the EPA-OIG provided their investigative findings to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA.

On September 6, 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA provided the Decision on Proposed Removal, reference the OI case concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to Assistant Inspector General for Investigations (AIGI) Patrick Sullivan (Sullivan), OIG, EPA.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) written decision to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), to remove (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) from employment, to take effect on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2017. After receiving notice of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) removal, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resigned from service.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the aforementioned, there are no remaining investigative steps and this investigation is recommended for closure with no further action.

¹ A MapQuest comparison of the direct route from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and the deviated route taken by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to facilitate a personal visit to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) show a 2 hour time difference and a difference of 53.5 miles.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20460

DATE: MARCH 15, 2017

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0040

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	EPA	

ALLEGATIONS: On September 16, 2015, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), Washington Field Office, was referred EPA OIG Hotline complaint 2015-339. In the referral, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged time and attendance fraud by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS: On October 19, 2015, the reporting agent created a spreadsheet using access reports to show the times (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) scanned into the Ronald Reagan Building in the morning and when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) scanned out in the afternoon. Card reader information is only retained for a 90-day period, so the reporting agent used the time period starting from 7/13/2015 and ending 10/05/2015. The reporting agent then acquired (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) People Plus records for the same corresponding dates to determine how (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allocated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) hours for each day. The spreadsheet was subsequently provided to the Agency for whatever action they deemed appropriate. The provided information was included as an administrative charge against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was issued a Notice of Proposed Removal and on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resigned from the EPA. As a condition of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resignation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) voluntarily signed a resignation settlement. As a result of the aforementioned investigative activities, this case is being closed with no further action.

DISPOSITION: Supported; Closed

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0063

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0116

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. EPA

CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	N/A

COMPLAINT: This investigation was predicated upon an OIG Hotline complaint, received on April 20, 2016, on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) which alleged erratic time and attendance by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA. In addition, the allegation reported that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to attend an official conference while on official government travel.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS: From January 31, 2016 to February 5, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to attend a conference as part of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) official duties and was considered AWOL. A review of records, receipts, credit card charges and several interviews did not support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the aforementioned, there are no investigative steps and this investigation is recommended for closure with no further action.

RELATED INVESTIGATION (OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0116): On October 24, 2016, the OIG Hotline received a complaint from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleging domestic abuse, prostitution and drug use by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

In this investigation the OIG identified two allegations to pursue. (1) During the period of time from approximately July 19, 2016 to October 21, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL on multiple days while (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). There was sufficient evidence to support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL for 18 days. (2) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used a controlled substance, violating the provisions of the Federal Free Workplace Program. In coordination with Labor and Employee

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

Relations, Agents received the results of two urinalysis tests conducted after reasonable suspicion was developed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was routinely using marijuana. This allegation was supported.

On February 24, 2017, Agents were notified that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was presented with a Notice of Proposed Removal and a BAR notice.

On June 8, 2017, Agents were notified of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) intention to appeal (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Notice of Proposed Removal to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

On August 29, 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) entered into a settlement agreement with the EPA.

No further information.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: OCTOBER 19, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0081

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED], GS-13, [REDACTED], EPA, OIG, [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7) (F)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED], GS-13	Washington, DC	

VIOLATION:

Misuse of EPA travel card by charging cash advances and fees to EPA travel card while not in official travel status in violation of EPA's official travel policy – *Resource Management Directive System 2550B, Official Travel* (effective April 17, 2015).

ALLEGATION:

On May 16, 2016, [REDACTED] referred an allegation of potential government credit card misconduct (cash advances while not in travel status) by [REDACTED], [REDACTED], EPA, OIG, [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7) (F) to EPA, OIG, Office of Investigations (OI). The EPA, OIG, OI initiated an administrative investigation into [REDACTED]'s potential EPA travel card misuse.

FINDINGS:

There is sufficient evidence to support the allegation that [REDACTED] violated EPA's Official Travel policy, *Resource Management Directive System 2550B*, by charging cash advances to [REDACTED] issued EPA travel card while not in official travel status.

OIG special agents obtained transaction history and credit card statements for [REDACTED]'s EPA travel card, which disclosed [REDACTED] travel card had a \$130.26 credit as of November 27, 2015; and there were a total of four (4) cash advances totaling \$356.50 with four (4) separate associated fees totaling \$14.04, while [REDACTED] was not in official travel status.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

█'s statement shows payments of \$121.03 on April 21, 2016, and \$119.25 on April 26, 2016, resulting in a \$0 balance on █'s EPA travel card.

On June 14, 2016, during an interview with OIG special agents, █ stated █ had some "issues" with submitting █ voucher and payments for █ last official travel in October of 2015, which may have resulted in an overpayment and an approximate \$130 credit on █ EPA travel card account. █ mistakenly thought the credit was for \$260 and intentionally charged two (2) cash advances to retrieve the money from the credit. █ added that █ left █ EPA issued travel card in █ wallet and mistakenly used it on two (2) additional occasions. █ stated when █ supervisor contacted █ about the cash withdrawals, █ paid the outstanding amount the same day.

At the conclusion of the interview, █ provided OIG agents with a sworn statement which stated, in part: "There was [a] credit balance with my Gov Credit card of \$130.00...I decided to get a cash advance to kida[sic] balance out the issue. I used the card twice on purpose...I used the card 2 more times...by mistake...I paid the bill at once."

DISPOSITION:

This case was not presented for criminal prosecution as the allegation is solely administrative

On July 27, 2016, █, informed EPA, OIG, OI that the following administrative actions were taken in response to the Final Summary Report issued on July 12, 2016.

1. Written warning, sent via email to █ on █ (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016 by █.
2. Written statement from █ to supervisor with plan of corrective action.
3. Documentation to supervisor documenting completion of EPA Travel Card Training by █.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE:

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-CAC-0082

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-15 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

This case closing report sets forth a summary of the investigation conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Investigation (OI), into allegations of threatening behavior by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

On August 7, 2014, EPA OIG OI met with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA regarding the allegations of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) potentially threatening behavior. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) expressed (b) (6), (b) (7) concern with the situation and indicated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) would begin to go raise the issue through (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) chain of command to ensure this issue was addressed immediately.

On October 17, 2014, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) issued a report titled: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) based in part on the EPA OIG's investigation.

On June 17, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Office of General Counsel emailed EPA, OIG, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) a copy of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) October 17, 2014 report.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) report determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not pose a threat to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employees, however (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was counseled on April 1, 2014 regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) communication style and received conflict management training.

Since no addition investigation by EPA OIG OI is contemplated, the instant case is being closed at this time via this final summary report.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: NOVEMBER 29, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) AND
SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0116

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0063

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); SES, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	N/A

COMPLAINT: The following investigations were predicated upon two separate complaints regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), that were referred to the EPA Office of Inspector General (OIG) on April 20, 2016 and October 24, 2016.

On April 20, 2016, the OIG Hotline received a complaint on behalf of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) senior management officials which alleged erratic time and attendance by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and revealed an instance in which, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to attend a conference while on official government travel.

On October 24, 2016, the OIG Hotline received a complaint from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleging (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) abuse, prostitution and drug use by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS: In reference to the two received complaints and information developed during the course of the investigation, the OIG identified three allegations to pursue. (1) During the period of time from approximately July 19, 2016 to October 21, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL on multiple days while (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). There was sufficient evidence to support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL for 18 days. (2) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used a controlled substance, violating the provisions of the Federal Free Workplace Program. In coordination with Labor and Employee Relations, Agents received the results of two urinalysis tests conducted after reasonable suspicion was developed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was routinely using marijuana. This allegation was supported. (3) Lastly, from January 31, 2016 to February 5, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to attend a conference as part of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) official duties and was considered AWOL. This allegation was investigated in a separate but related case, numbered OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0063. A review of records, receipts, credit card charges and several interviews did not support a finding that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was AWOL.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

On February 24, 2017, Agents were notified that (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) was presented with a Notice of Proposed Removal and a BAR notice.

On April 7, 2017, an OIG Final Summary Report was delivered to (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) Office of General Counsel, EPA and (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) EPA.

On June 8, 2017, Agents were notified of (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) intention to appeal (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) Notice of Proposed Removal to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

On October 18, 2017, Agents were notified of (b) (6), (b) (7) (C) intention to settle the Notice of Proposed Removal.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the aforementioned, there are no remaining investigative steps and this investigation is recommended for closure with no further action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: AUGUST 3, 2017

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0031

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0119

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

GS-13, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

EPA

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-13	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION:

18 U.S.C. § 641: Theft of Public Money, Property or Records

ALLEGATION:

On November 14, 2013, the Office of Professional Responsibility, Office of Investigations, Office of Inspector General (OIG), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received an EPA OIG Hotline complaint reporting potential employee misconduct by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

EPA, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

EPA.

Specifically, the complaint alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was out of the office for extended periods of time and fraudulently claimed regular and/or telework hours on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance records. The complaint also alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knowingly approved (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance even though fraudulent information was reported.

FINDINGS:

There was sufficient evidence to support the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) submitted and attested time and attendance records that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in work status while in fact (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was on personal international travel. OIG special agents identified that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) took seven (7) international trips from December 21, 2009 to January 3, 2016, while each time claiming regular and/or telework hours. Based on a limited audit of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time and attendance records, which were compared to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(E) claimed 109.5 hours of work totaling \$5,707.93 while on personal international travel.

DISPOSITION:

On August 16, 2016, this case was presented to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. The Fraud and Public Corruption Section (FPCS) declined federal prosecution of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) based on the (b) (5), (b) (7)(E) [REDACTED].

On March 10, 2017, the EPA OIG issued a Final Summary Report regarding this investigation to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] EPA, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] Office of General Counsel, EPA.

On March 16, 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] informed the case agent that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] resigned from federal service, effective (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] 2017, and therefore the EPA could not take any administrative action against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] also informed the case agent that the agency would attempt to recover p any funds paid to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] that have been deemed fraudulent.

If EPA recovers any funds deemed fraudulent by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED], this case will be re-opened to memorialize the action.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2017

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0082

CROSS REFERENCE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0075

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION(S):

1. 18 U.S.C. § 1001 – False statements
2. 40 CFR § 7.120 – Nondiscrimination in Programs Receiving Federal Assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency, Complaint Investigations
3. EPA ORDER 3120.1 – Appendix-Guidance on Corrective Discipline: (7) Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful; (16) Deliberate misrepresentation, falsification, concealment or withholding of a material fact, or refusal to testify or cooperate in an official proceeding; (22) Negligent performance of duties; (27) Forging or falsifying official Government records or documents
4. EPA Order 4701: Title VI Case Management Protocol

ALLEGATION:

On April 12, 2016, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received an EPA OIG Hotline complaint reporting potential employee misconduct and mismanagement regarding the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) electronic mailbox (e-mail account) of the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged that management officials in the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) falsified records, attempted to “cover-up” information related to a Flint, Michigan resident who submitted a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) complaint to the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) e-mail account, and failed to inform the EPA Administrator of the complaints they received related to contamination in Flint, Michigan’s water system when queried for input for the Administrator’s Congressional testimony.

On June 3, 2016, a case was initiated to investigate the aforementioned allegations against the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (Case number: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0075). As indicated in that case’s Report of Investigation (ROI), the allegations of misconduct alleged to have been specifically committed by management officials in the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was reported in separate ROIs. Thus, separate

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

investigations were initiated, and this investigation specifically focused on the allegation related to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Based upon the foregoing information, as well as additional information independently obtained during the course of the investigation, the OIG identified and investigated the following allegation posed against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) directed an (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee to use an inaccurate date on an acknowledgement letter, even though (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knew it was not accurate. Specifically, at the direction of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) issued an acknowledgment letter to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), a complainant who e-mailed the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) e-mail account, stating that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) e-mailed complaint on March 8, 2016, although (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) e-mail to the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was sent on February 25, 2015.

FINDINGS:

The allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knowingly directed an (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee to use an inaccurate date on an acknowledgement letter that was sent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is inconclusive. During interviews with OIG special agent, the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided different explanations as to why an inaccurate date was on the acknowledgement letter. The (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) directed them to use the date of March 8, 2016 instead of February 25, 2015, but (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not recall telling the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employee to use the incorrect date.

DISPOSITION:

During the review of related case number OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0075, the Civil Division, Civil Rights Division, and Fraud and Public Corruption Division, Department of Justice, Washington DC, reviewed all the facts related to the allegation concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). On August 25, 2016, the Civil Division declined civil action based on no (b) (5), (b) (7)(E). On August 29, 2016, the Civil Rights Division declined prosecution based on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5), (b) (7)(E). In addition, on December 19, 2016, the Fraud and Public Corruption Division declined prosecution for potential violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1001, 18 U.S.C. § 1016 and 18 U.S.C. § 1038, as such, this was purely an administrative investigation.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retired from federal service, therefore no administrative action was taken by the EPA.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: AUGUST 29, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0092

CROSS REFERENCE #: HOTLINE COMP
2016-0188

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

COMPLAINT: Violation of telework agreement, and locality pay.

BACKGROUND:

On May 17, 2016, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received information via a hotline complaint (OIG General Hotline Complaint 2016-0188) that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in violation of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) telework agreement. This complaint was initially declined by the Office of Investigations (OI) and the Washington Field Office-OI, Office of the Inspector General (OIG). On February 7, 2017, the complaint was resubmitted by the Labor and Employee Relations Division (LERD), EPA.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

Based on the complaint and information gathered during the investigation, OI identified and investigated the following allegations: 1. Did (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) from approximately 2011 until 2017, reside and telework in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) while claiming a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) address on official signed telework agreements, and 2. Did (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) list a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) address on an official signed medical flexiplace agreement while teleworking from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) residence in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) from March 2016 to May 2016, while claiming Washington, DC locality pay. Based upon the evidence both allegations are supported.

On May 17, 2017, OIG Special Agents conducted a recorded interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). During the interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) lived at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has considered (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) permanent residence since

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

2011. Further, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has teleworked on a weekly basis from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) since 2011.

According to LERD, from 2011 through 2016, all of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) signed telework agreements list a (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) address. Specifically, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) most recent telework agreement, dated August 2, 2016, listed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) authorized telework address. In addition, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) signed a medical flexiplace agreement with the same (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) address on February 18, 2016. All (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) medical documentation was from providers in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

OIG Special Agents reviewed the EPA issued cellular phone records of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) during the time frame from February 2016 to March 2017. This review identified that during that time most of the outgoing calls by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) originated from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in telework and medical flexiplace status.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was counseled and presented with a five-day suspension that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) served in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017. At that time, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) telework agreement was suspended. On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) submitted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resignation to the EPA. LERD reported (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was in AWOL status for failure to appear for work as scheduled prior to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resignation.

RECOMMENDATION:

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2017, OPR obtained a copy of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SF50, confirming (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) resignation from the EPA effective (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2017.

This case is recommended for closure with no further investigatory action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: APRIL 5, 2018

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0141

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-14, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION(S): Purely Administrative: Employee Misconduct: Inconsistencies reported on personnel documentation utilized to obtain employment.

ALLEGATION: This investigation was initiated when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noticed numerous inconsistencies pertaining to periods of unemployment and over-lapping periods of federal and contractor employment, contained within the personnel paperwork utilized by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, to gain employment, and contacted the OIG with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) concerns.

FINDINGS: Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), EPA, conducted a document review and confirmed the inconsistencies identified by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) then conducted an interview with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who acknowledged the reported inconsistencies, but stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not sure why (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) previous employment positions and over-lapping periods of unemployment in this manner. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) maintained that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never purposefully misrepresented (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) time periods and positions of employment and unemployment.

DISPOSITION: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) used the admissions obtained in the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interview as a basis to terminate (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employment within (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) one (1) year probationary status. This case was a purely administrative case. Based upon the aforementioned, there are no remaining investigative steps and this investigation is recommended for closure with no further action. Should new information become available, the EPA-OIG retains the right to re-open the investigation.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: APRIL 23, 2018

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2018-ADM-0014

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

EPA

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION(S): 18 USC § 1001 – False Statements

ALLEGATION: This investigation was initiated after receiving a referral from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regarding alleged employee misconduct by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA. Specifically, it is alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not report leaving previous employment at the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), under threat of being fired on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OPM-306 form.

FINDINGS: Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), EPA, opened an investigation into the matter at the direction of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) OPR, OI, OIG, EPA. SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted numerous document and personnel file reviews, to include (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) personnel file at the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) discussed the matter with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) officials and was informed that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not under threat of removal when (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) self-terminated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employment with the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The allegation is not supported.

DISPOSITION: The case was not presented to the United States Attorney's Office – District of Washington D.C. (USAO – DC) and was handled in an administrative manner only. Based upon the aforementioned, there are no remaining investigative steps and this investigation is recommended for closure with no further action. Should new information become available, the EPA-OIG retains the right to re-open the investigation.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: FEBRUARY 13, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0120

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	

VIOLATION(S):

18 U.S. Code § 1001 - Statements or entries generally (False Statements)

ALLEGATION:

On March 27, 2014, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG) Hotline, received a letter reporting that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reported false information on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Standard Form 85P (SF-85P), "Questionnaire for Public Trust Positions." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) indicated on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SF-85P that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received a Bachelor of Science from Ohio State University (OSU). However, during the course of an investigation by OPM, it was determined that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not possess a Bachelor of Science degree.

FINDINGS:

There is sufficient evidence to support the allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) improperly claimed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) earned a Bachelor of Science degree from OSU on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SF-85P, which was signed December 20, 2010. On November 25, 2015, during an interview with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA OIG agents asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) if after considering all of the facts and information (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has received over the past few years regarding (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) claim that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) received a degree from the OSU if (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) felt (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) correctly claimed a degree from OSU on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SF85. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) responded "No. Knowing now what I know the answer is no." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) continued "At this point in time I have to say the answer is no. I took it [Ohio State degree] off my resume."

DISPOSITION:

On November 19, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for violations of 18 USC 1001 – False Statements. As such the case is solely administrative.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency: it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

On June 2, 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) issued a Notice of Proposed Removal to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) signed a settlement agreement with the EPA which was amended on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016.

On (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), 2016, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) transferred to a position with the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

MAR 18 2015

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT

SUBJECT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Case Number: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0120

FROM: Patrick F. Sullivan
Assistant Inspector General for Investigations
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Office of Inspector General (OIG)

all for DAICT

TO: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(With Attachments)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Associate General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
(Without Attachments)

This final summary report sets forth the EPA OIG's investigative finding for your review concerning the above referenced case. This report includes the eleven investigative documents used in our review, which will also be relevant to your review process in determining whether administrative action is warranted.

As background, on March 27, 2014, the EPA OIG received an allegation that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had potentially reported false information on (b) standard form 85P, "Questionnaire for Public Trust Positions" from the EPA, Personnel Security Branch (PSB). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) indicated on (b) SF-85P that (b) received a Bachelor of Science from Ohio State University (OSU). However, during the course of the investigation, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM)¹ determined that (b) (6), had not earned a degree from OSU. We initiated an investigation into whether (b) (6), had provided false information on (b) SF-85P. (b) (7) (6)

¹ The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) conducts background investigations of potential and current EPA employees. OPM submits the findings to the EPA PSB for a suitability determination.

On November 25, 2015 EPA OIG agents interviewed (b) (6). EPA OIG agents asked (b) (6), if after considering all of the facts and information (b) (6) has received over the past few years (b) (7) regarding (b) (6) claim that (b) (6) received a degree from the OSU if (b) (6) felt (b) (6) correctly claimed a degree from OSU on (b) (6) SF85. (b) (6), responded "No. Knowing now what I know the answer is no." (b) (6), continued (b) (6) "At this point in time I have to say the answer is no. I took it [Ohio State degree] off my resume." (b) (6), explained that (b) (6) left OSU before the graduation ceremony over thirty years prior. (b) (6), told EPA OIG agents that (b) (6) had (b) (6) original degree mailed directly to (b) (6) first employer, the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) added that (b) (6) was (b) (6) originally in the School of Architecture and transferred to the School of Engineering. (b) (6), added that (b) (6) was upset and trying to collect proof of (b) (6) education claim but was unsuccessful because a lot of time had passed and many of the records were on paper or no longer maintained by (b) (6) former employers. (b) (6)

OIG agents asked (b) (6), if (b) (6) current position has an education requirement. (b) (6), responded that it does not. (b) (6), commented that (b) (6) is close to retirement and (b) (6) doesn't consider this situation a priority at this time. (b) (6), (b) (7)

Based upon the foregoing, there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that (b) (6), improperly claimed (b) (6) earned a degree from OSU on (b) (6) SF-85P signed December 20, 2010. (b) (6)

On November 19, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of (b) (6), for violations of 18 USC 1001 – False Statements. As such, this case is solely administrative. I am providing you with this Final Summary Report, along with supporting documentation, for your review and to enable the Agency to take whatever administrative action is deemed appropriate. (b) (6), (b) (7)

My office is taking no further investigatory action in this matter; however, in order that we may satisfy our reporting requirement to Congress and the Administrator, please advise this office within 30 days of receipt of this Final Summary Report of the administrative action taken or proposed by you in this matter, if any. This final summary report is "For Official Use Only" and its disclosure to unauthorized individuals is prohibited. Portions of it may be used by appropriate officials for administrative action. Please return this report after your review of this matter is completed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 202-56 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

ATTACHMENT

1. Memorandum of Activity – Final Summary Report Attachments